## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is made in response to the Office Action dated June 2, 2008. Claim 1 is pending in the present application. Claim 1 has been rejected. Claim 1 has been amended to further define the scope and novelty of the present invention, in order to place claim 1 in condition for allowance. New claims 13-17 have been added. Support for the amendments to the claims and new claims 13-17 is found on page 5, line 30, to page 6, line 4; on page 11, lines 4-6; on page 15, lines 12-23; on page 17, line 28, to page 18, line 2; on page 19, lines 10-12 and 23-27; on page 25, lines 1-5; on page 29, lines 22-24; and in section 5: CICS BMS (Basic Mapping Support) Metamodel on pages 51-72; more specifically, on page 61, lines 14-17; on page 62, lines 1-2, on page 61, lines 30-32; and on page 70, line 15. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been presented. Accordingly, claims 1 and 13-17 are pending. For the reasons set forth more fully below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are allowable. Consequently, reconsideration, allowance, and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

In the event, however, that the Examiner is not persuaded by Applicants' amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the amendments and arguments to clarify issues upon appeal.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has stated:

> **Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ben-Shachar (US 5,761,656) in view of Deborin (see PTO-892 mailed 24 August 2007) and Hardman et al. (US Pat. 6,067,579; "Hardman"). …**

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections. The present invention provides a method of processing an application request on an end user application and an application server including a runtime middleware. In accordance with the present invention, the method includes: a) initiating the application request on the end user application in a first language with a first application program, wherein the end user application is a web browser, a SOAP application, or a Java application; b) transmitting the application request to the server and converting the application request from the first language of the first end user application to a form for the mapping support language running on the application server, wherein the end user application is connected to the application server through a runtime middleware that is an application or a web application server, the web application server comprising a connector; c) processing said application request on the application server; and d) transmitting a response to the application request from the application server to the end user application, and converting the response to the application request from the mapping support language running on the application server to the first language of the first end user application. The connector comprises invocation and transformation capabilities, wherein the connector comprises a language metamodel to define data structures that represent connector interfaces, wherein the language metamodel indicates a source language, a target language, and a mapping between the source language and the target language, wherein the language metamodel comprises declaration text that is not editable, wherein the connector comprises a type descriptor metamodel that language is neutral and that defines a physical realization, a storage mapping, and a plurality of constraints, wherein the type descriptor metamodel provides a physical representation of individual fields of a given data structure, wherein the type descriptor metamodel provides data types mapping

between languages, wherein the connector comprises invocation metamodel data, application domain interface metamodel data, transaction message metamodel data, and type descriptor metamodel data. The connector is configured to (i) convert the application request from the first language of the first end user application as a source language to the language running on the application server as a target language, and (ii) convert a response to the application request from the language running on the application server as a source language to the first language of the first end user application as a target language. Each includes the steps of: 1) invoking connector metamodels of respective source language and target mapping support language; 2) populating the connector metamodels with metamodel data of each of the respective source language and target mapping support language, the metamodel data comprising 3270 screen formatting for 3270-based applications, the metamodel data comprising a Basic Mapping Support (BMS) map, a BMS mapset, a BMS mapfield, and BMS attributes, wherein the BMS mapset comprises a plurality of programming attributes, wherein the programming attributes comprise a storage operand that varies based on a language of an application program, wherein the BMS attributes comprise a control attribute that defines characteristics of 3270 terminals, and an alarm attribute that activates a 3270 audible alarm; and 3) converting the source language to the mapping support language. Ben-Shachar in view of Deborin does not teach or suggest these features, as discussed below.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ben-Shachar does not teach or suggest "initiating the application request on the end user application in a first language with a first application program, wherein the end user application is a web browser, a SOAP application, or a Java application," recited in amended independent claim 1. The Examiner has referred to column 5,

lines 6-33, of Ben-Shachar as disclosing this step. However, this section of Ben-Shachar describes an end user application that is a web browser. In contrast to Ben-Shachar, the end user application can also be a SOAP application, or a Java application. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable over Ben-Shachar for at least this reason.

A secondary reference stands or falls with the primary reference. Because Ben-Shachar fails to teach or suggest this initiating step, a combination of Ben-Shachar, Deborin, and Hardman also fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Ben-Shachar in view of Deborin in view of Hardman.

Applicants respectfully submit that Ben-Shachar in view of Deborin in view of Hardman does not teach or suggest populating the connector metamodels with metamodel data, "the metamodel data comprising 3270 screen formatting for 3270-based applications, the metamodel data comprising a Basic Mapping Support (BMS) map, a BMS mapset, a BMS mapfield, and BMS attributes, wherein the BMS mapset comprises a plurality of programming attributes, wherein the programming attributes comprise a storage operand that varies based on a language of an application program, wherein the BMS attributes comprise a control attribute that defines characteristics of 3270 terminals, and an alarm attribute that activates a 3270 audible alarm," recited in amended independent claim 1.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that Ben-Shachar fails to specifically teach the 3270 screen formatting for 3270-based applications feature as claimed. The Examiner has relied on Hardman to cure the defects of Ben-Shachar. The Examiner stated that Hardman discloses capturing screen formatting to create the transformation rules. However, Hardman merely teaches using a "screen capture and visual editing tool" for creating "transformation rules to

guide conversation between the end user presentation interface and the application data stream expectations" (column 3, line 64, to column 4, line 2). Hardman does not specifically mention or suggest "metamodel data comprising 3270 screen formatting for 3270-based applications. Hardman only generally refers to a "screen capture and visual editing tool."

Furthermore, Hardman fails to teach or suggest the metamodel data that includes "a Basic Mapping Support (BMS) map, a BMS mapset, a BMS mapfield, and BMS attributes, wherein the BMS mapset comprises a plurality of programming attributes, wherein the programming attributes comprise a storage operand that varies based on a language of an application program, wherein the BMS attributes comprise a control attribute that defines characteristics of 3270 terminals, and an alarm attribute that activates a 3270 audible alarm." Nowhere does Hardman, or the other cited references teach or suggest these features.

Therefore, Ben-Shachar in view of Deborin in view of Hardman does not teach or suggest the cooperation of elements as recited in amended independent claim 1, and this claim is allowable over Ben-Shachar in view of Deborin in view of Hardman.

New claims 13-17

New independent claim 15 is a computer-program product claim similar in scope to amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to amended independent claim 1 apply with equal force to claim 15. Therefore, claim 15 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

New dependent claims 13-14 and 16-17 depend from independent claims 1 and 15, respectively. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to independent claims 1 and

15 apply with equal force to claims 13-14 and 16-17, which are thus allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 15. Furthermore, claims 13-14 and 16-17 recites features that are not described or suggested in the cited references. Accordingly, claims 13-14 and 16-17 are allowable for at least this reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 13-17 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes that this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

July 22, 2008
Date

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 30,801
(650) 493-4540